

B2 end
specified in a second notation without translating the object definition specified in the second notation into the first notation.

Q3 Sub G3/7
11. (Amended) A system for storing object definition information comprising a parser for object definition information, an object factory for instantiating objects encapsulating said object definition information, said objects having pre-defined interfaces without translating the object definition information.

Q4 Sub B4/7
17. (Amended) A software object comprising an interface defined in a first notation for manipulating an object at least partially defined in a second notation without translating the at least partial definition from the second notation into the first notation, said second notation being different from said first notation.

Not Cancel
Q5 Sub D3
21. (Amended) A method of constructing an object invocation comprising the steps of:
instantiating an object collection of objects corresponding to rules
specifying the syntax of said object invocation;
receiving information of the content of the object invocation; and
interrogating the object collection with the information to determine a set of objects sufficient to construct the invocation without translating the information into the syntax of the object invocation.

REMARKS

In the office action of August 5, 1999 the Examiner objected claim 1 for including minor informality. The Examiner further rejected claims 1-12 and 14-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Foody et al. (U.S.P.N. 5,732,270; the Foody patent) and claim 13 over Foody patent in view of CORBA Specification 1.1.

With respect to the objection, claim 1 has been amended as recommended by the Examiner. Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the objection.

With respect to the rejections, amended claim 1 requires that one or more objects defined in a first notation encapsulating object definition information specified in a second notation "without translating the object definition information specified in the second

notation into the first notation.” This feature, in combination with the other features of amended claim 1, allows objects defined in the first notation to invoke or instantiate objects defined in the second notation without losing information. Since the newly added feature of amended claim 1 was fully discussed in the originally filed specification (see page 7, lines 10-20), Applicant believes no new matter is introduced by the amendment.

The Foody patent does not show the above recited feature of amended claim 1. More specifically, the Foody patent is related to enabling objects from two or more heterogeneous objects systems to inter-operate. The Foody patent provides detailed description on each aspect of its invention in eight different sections. One of the sections is directed to “7) The object Exporting Framework: a framework to export object definitions,” from col. 16, line 9 to col. 18, line 7. In this section, a generalized life cycle of objects is first discussed by referring to FIG. 8. The discussion then turns to a framework to export object definition in accordance with the invention described in the Foody patent. As an integral part of this framework, the Foody patent describes the following:

Another aspect of exposing classes is registering them in the native object systems "repository." This may involve generating an interface description in a "language" appropriate to the foreign object system (such as Interface Definition Language or IDL in CORBA systems, a Type Library in COM, or C++ header files). It may also require that the OSA use an API to register the class with the object system's repository. (From col. 16, line 64 to col. 17, line 4.)

In other words, the export framework according to the Foody patent requires translating object definition information of one object system to another object system, as in “generating an interface description ... in the foreign object system.” Since the Foody patent explicitly teaches the translation step, the invention embodied in amended claim 1 of the present invention is patentably distinct from the Foody patent.

Moreover, other amended independent claims, claims 7, 11, 17 and 21, also require a similar feature as that recited above in connection with amended claim 1, these claims are also not rendered obvious in view of the Foody patent.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under §103 be withdrawn and the claims be allowed.

Applicant respectfully submits that the entire application is now in condition for allowance, early notice of which would be appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 6, 1999 (Monday)

Barry D. Rein
By Anthony H. Kahng
By: Barry D. Rein (Reg. No. 22,411)
Anthony H. Kahng (Reg. No. 42,704)

PENNIE & EDMONDS LLP

1667 K Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-4400